



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

VERIZON
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 500
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

COPY MAILED

DEC 21 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

ON PETITION

In re Application of
Mark G. Prestoy
Application No. 09/252,326
Filed: February 18, 1999
Attorney Docket No. 98-906

:
:
:
:
:

This is a decision in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed September 7, 2007, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is GRANTED.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely respond to a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences mailed May 1, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed August 28, 2007. In response on September 7, 2007, the present petition was filed, along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114.


There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of John M. Mulcahy appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to petitioner. However, if Mr. Mulcahy desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. All future correspondence regarding this application file will be directed solely to the address of record.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), including the fee of \$790 and the submission required by 37 CFR 1.114; (2) the petition fee of \$1,500; and (3) an adequate statement of unintentional delay¹.

¹ 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. While the statement is not made by an attorney of record, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 2623 for processing of the RCE and for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the amendment submitted in accordance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204. Inquiries relating to further prosecution should be directed to the Technology Center.



Sherry D. Brinkley
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: JOHN MULCAHY
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
TWO FREEDOM SQUARE
11955 FREEDOM DRIVE
RESTON, VA 20190--567